N

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/896,207	06/28/2001	Travis J. Muhlestein	MS1-692US	7580

22801	7590	04/08/2004		

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER
TRUONG, LECHI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	2

DATE MAILED: 04/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
. .Office Action Summary	09/896,207	TRAVIS
	Examiner	Art Unit
	LeChi Truong	2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *28 June 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application)
since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet.
37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific
reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . 6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-37 are presented for the examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2.   Claims 1-26, 33, 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Memmontt et al (US. 6,560,591 B1) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) and further in view of

UT (using the command-Line Utility)

3.   **As to claim 1,** Memmontt teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a X

utility (the data resolver 120/ data provider 130, col 3, ln 42-62/ selection task P120 as a decision

tree, col 4, ln 21-60col 5, ln 18-30/ interface module 140, col 8, ln 63-67 to col 9, ln 1-19), one or

more computer readable media (mediaAccessdevice, col 3,l n 35-42), an object model command

schema (the appreciate priority list indicates that data provider which uses the CIM distributed

management scheme, col 8, ln 41-55/ col 7, ln 40-40-66), a mapping(mapping, col 5, ln 47-60),

one or more commands(query alias, col 5, ln 47-60, class and subclass, col 5, ln 18-31), an

object target schema(the distributed management schemes for the query / a similar scheme such

as Windows Management Interface, col 3, ln 28-40/ a particular distributed management scheme,

col 3, ln 54-61).

4.   Memmontt does not explicit teach the term generated the one or more commands.

However, APA teaches generated the one or more commands (made up of classes representing

management applications, page 3, ln 7-18).

5.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Memmontt and APA because APA's "made up of classes"

would provides access to management information on a single network machine, or a large

number of machines all at once.

6.   Memmontt and APA do not teach X as the command-Line. However, UT teaches

Command line (command line, Page 1).

7.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Memmontt, APA and UT because UT's Command line

would performs a transformation.

8.   **As to claim 2,** Memmontt teaches an alias class (class 1, col 5, ln 18-30/ col 4, ln 40-60),

a command template (list, col 5, ln 18-30), a single command (sub-class, col 5, ln 18-30).

9.   **As to claim 3,** Memmontt teaches a verb class/ a format class/a connection class as a

subclass (subclass, col 5, ln 17-30/ the next node in the decision tree, col 4, ln 40-60), each

instance of the verb class/ format class/ connection class (a storage devie or a display devices,

col 4, ln 36-60), a list of properties (list B /C, col 6, ln 18-30/ col 5, ln 46-60/ col 8, ln 1-15), a

connection to a target namespace (the namespace of the data provider, col 5, ln 46-60).

10.   **As to claim 4,** Memmontt teaches a parameter class as subclass (sub-sub class, col 5, ln

18-30), each instance of the parameter class resenting parameters (internal to the system or

external, col 4, ln 36-60).

11.   **As to claim 5,** Memmontt teaches a property class as a subclass to the format class (sub-sub class, col 5, ln 18-30), each instance of the property class representing property value (temperature, hard disk drive status, col 4, ln 55-60), a list of properties (list corresponding to queries, col 4, ln 55-60).

12.   **As to claim 6, 7,** Memmontt teaches a localized string class/ a qualifiers class (class 1, class 2, col 5, ln 18-30), each instance (a hardware device or software application, col 4, ln 36-60), language specific text/ qualifiers (CPU speed/ capacity... col 4, ln 40-60/ version, col 7, ln 50-67).

13.   **As to claim 8**, a see-also association (a list, col 4, ln 55-60/ col 5, ln 18-30), each instance (CPU speed and or temperature... col 4, ln 40-60), an alias (class 1/ class 2, col 5,1 n 18-30).

14.   **As to claim 9**, Memmontt teaches role-oriented (class, subclass, col 5, ln 18-30), namespace (namespace, col 5, ln 48-60/ col 6, ln 45-55), command related to particular administrative tasks are found together (all queries relating to a particular hardware or software component or all queries within the same class or subclass, col 7, ln 50-67/ other parts thought the decision tree may lead to lists corresponding to queries relating to other hardware components (CPU speed and or / temperature, hard disk status and / or capacity, et al ., col 4, ln 55-60).

15.   **As to claim 10, 11,** Memmontt teaches the generation of additional commands to added/ permits reconfiguration of the one or more commands (upgrade components and/ or components added later, col 5, ln 18-30).

16.   **As to claim 12,** it is an apparatus claim of claims 2-8; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reasons as claims 2-8.

17.   **As to claim 13,** Memmontt teaches target scheme (data requestor, col 3, ln 16-41), a

WMI object mode (WMI, col 3, ln 16-41).

18.   **As to claim 14,** Memmontt teaches a plurality of command schemas (class 1/ class 2, col

5, ln 18-30), an instant of one or more commands (subclass, col 5, ln 18-30).

19.   **As to claim 15,** Memmontt teaches a local machine/ remote machines (different machine

and communication, col 3, ln 12-25).

20.   **As to claim 16,** it is an apparatus claim of claim 12; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 12 above.

21.   **As to claim 17,** it is an apparatus claim of claim1; therefore, it is rejected for the same

reason as claim 1 above. In additional, Memmontt teaches an interface utility (interface module

140, col 8, ln 63-67 to col 9, ln 1-19/ the data resolver 120/ data provider 130, col 3, ln 42-62/

selection task P120 as a decision tree, col 4, ln 21-60col 5, ln 18-30).

22.   **As to claim 18,** Memmontt teaches a command line utility (interface module 140, col 8,

ln 63-67 to col 9, ln 1-19/ the data resolver 120/ data provider 130, col 3, ln 42-62/ selection task

P120 as a decision tree, col 4, ln 21-60col 5, ln 18-30).

23.   **As to claim 19,** Memmontt teaches a graphic user interface (in another application of

data resolver 120, the query maybe received from a data requestor who is a human user, col 4, ln

5-9).

24.   **As to claims 20-22,** they are apparatus claims of claims 9-11; therefore, they are rejected

for the same reasons as claims 9-11.

25.   **As to claim 23**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 12; therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claim 12 above.

26.   **As to claim 24 and 25**, they are apparatus claims of claims 1, 12; therefore, it is rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 12 above.

27.   **As to claim 26,** Memmontt teaches second object model (data requestor 110, col 3, ln 26-40), a WMI object model (WMI, col 3, ln 26-40).

28.   **As to claim 33**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 1; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 1 above. Further, Memmontt teaches a user interface (a human user, col 4, ln 5-9), parameter (the query, col 4, ln 5- 9), an alias class (class 1/ class 2, col 5, ln 20-30). Memmontt does not explicit teach the term " an object-oriented command schema". However, APA teaches an object oriented command schema (an object oriented structure defined using WMI schemas, page 2, ln 23-26).

29.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Memmontt and APA because APA's "an object oriented command schema" would supports the management of systems and devices by exposing management information across an enterprise.

30.   **As to claim 37**, it is an apparatus claim of claim 33; therefore, it is rejected for the same reason as claim 33 above.

31.   Claims 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Memmontt et al (US. 6,560,591 B1) in view of Scumpu (Session 3: CIM Diagnostics Development

Guidelines and Demo) and further in view of Steve (Network and System Management with

XML).

32.   **As to claim 27,** Memmontt teach a command (the query, col 3, ln 26-48), Y interface (the

data resolver 120/ data provider 130, col 3, ln 42-62/ selection task P120 as a decision tree, col 4,

ln 21-60col 5, ln 18-30/ interface module 140, col 8, ln 63-67 to col 9, ln 1-19), an alias (class 1/

class 2, col 5, ln 18-30/ decision tree, col 4, ln 22-60), interpreting (error handing/ time out

occurs, col 6, ln 25 –58/ Fig. 8), based on the alias (determine whether further list entries, col 6,

ln 25-42), the current operating environment of the command line interface(response has been

received from the data provider, col 6, ln 42-58), executing(mapping, col 5, ln 47-60), a target

namespace(the namespace of provider, col 5,1 n 47-60), XML form(extensible markup language

(XML), col 3, ln 27-40), presenting (returned , col 3, ln 55-62).

33.   Memmott does not teach WMI API. However, Scumpu teaches WMI API (the WMI API,

page 5, ln 7).

34.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Memmott and Scumpu because Scumpu's WMI API would

provides the methods for accessing Management functionality through a command line utility

more consistent.

35.   Memmott and Scumpu do not teach Y as command line, applying an XSL style sheet.

However, Steve teaches command line (a command line interface, page 5 of 8, ln -8), an XSL

style sheet (XSL, page 4of 8, ln 38-45 to page 5 of 8, ln 1-8).

36.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at time the invention

was made to combine the teaching of Memmott, Scumpu and Steve because Steve's command

line and XSL would display as a style sheet defied view of a body of data expressed with XML.

37.   As to claim 28, Memmott teaches an instance of an alias class(CPU speed an / or

temperature, col 4, ln 50-60).

38.   **As to claim 29,** Memmott teaches command entries (list entries, col 6, ln 45-55).

39.   **As to claim 30,** Memmott teaches a primary class (class 1, class 2, col 3, ln 20-30).

40.   **As to claim 31, 32,** they are apparatus of claim 12, 27; therefore, they are rejected for the

same reason as claims 12, 27 above.

41.   Claims 34-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Memmontt

et al (US. 6,560,591 B1) in view of Admitted Prior Art (APA) in view of UT(Using The

Command line Unitily) in view of Steve (Network and System Management with XML).

42.   As to claim 34, Memmott teaches data (the query characteristic, col 6, ln 45-58), user

interface (human user, col 4, ln 5-9), target object (the distributed management schemes for the

query / a similar scheme such as Windows Management Interface, col 3, ln 28-40/ a particular

distributed management scheme, col 3, ln 54-61), XML (XML, col 3, ln 29-40), the alias (class

1/ class 2, col 5, ln 20-30).

43.   Memmott , APA and UT do not teach an XSL style sheet, formatting the data,

displaying data. However, Steve teaches   an XSL style sheet (XSL, page 4of 8, ln 38-45 to page

5 of 8, ln 1-8), formatting the data, displaying data (the XML document can also be format and

displayed with Cascading Style Sheets(CSS) ... XSL which take better qualities of CSS, page 4 of 8 , ln 38-45).

44.   It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Memmott, APA , UT and Steve because Steve's XSL, "the XML document can also be format and displayed with Cascading Style Sheets(CSS)... XSL which take better qualities of CSS" would display as a style sheet defied view of a body of data expressed with XML.

45.   **As to claim 35,** Steve teaches command line user interface (a command line user interface, page 5 of 8, ln 1-8).

46.   **As to claim 36,** Steve teaches graphic user interface (GUI, page 5 of 89, ln 1-8).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on 703-305-9678. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR of Public PAIP. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIP

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197(toll-free).

LeChi Truong

April 2, 2004

MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100